



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,126	08/05/2002	Brett Smith	1367-9	2505
81099	7590		EXAMINER	
Thomas M. Galgano			SORKOWITZ, DANIEL M	
20 W. Park Avenue				
Suite 204			ART UNIT	
Long Beach, NY 11561			PAPER NUMBER	
			3622	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			03/02/2010	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/089,126

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

DANIEL SORKOWITZ

Art Unit

3622

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/22/10.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 21, 23, 24 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 21, 23, 24 and 27-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

This communication is in response to the RCE for application 10/089126 filed on 2/22/20010. Claims 15, 20, 22, and 25-26 have been cancelled by Applicant. Claims 1-15, 16-19, 21, 23-24, and 27-30 have been examined.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/22/2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to

enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 1-15, 16-19, 21, 23-24, and 27-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C.

112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement

requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding claims 1-2, 17-18, 21, 23-24, and 27-28 , these claims recite the limitation " non-targeted advertising". The limitation is not supported by the specification. Any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure. The mere absence of a positive recitation is not basis for an exclusion. See MPEP 21 73.05(i). Claims 3-14, 16, 19, 24, and 29 inherit this rejection as each depends from claims 1, 17, 21, or 28.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 2. Claims 1-15, 16-19, 21, 23-24, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Regarding claims 1-2, 17-18, 21, 23-24, and 27-28 this claim recites The term " non-targeted advertising". This term is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term " random non-targeted advertising " is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Every advertisement is targeted to some audience, such as English speakers, or English readers, as many Chinese consumers would not be able to read English messages. Even the least targeted advertisement possible, such as an advertisement in the New York Times newspaper, could be considered targeted to the readership of the newspaper, or even to the residents of New York City. Claims 3-14, 16, 19, 24, and 29 inherit this rejection as each depends from claims 1, 17, 21, or 28.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15, 16-19, 21, 23-24, and 27-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldhaber in view of US Patent Number 6,928,615 to Haitzuka et al. (hereinafter "Haitzuka").

Regarding claim 1, Goldhaber discloses a system and method comprising; a consumer station which receives electronic data or images (figure 4, 104, column 11, lines 11-24); an information provider which delivers said electronic data or images to said consumer station (figure 1, 106, column 9 lines 62-67), a host with which said consumer station communicates and interacts (figure 1, 106, column 9 lines 62-67), an advertising provider associated with said host and which delivers advertising to the host for optional viewing by the participant (figure 1, 106, column 9 lines 62-67); whereby advertisements are delivered randomly from the advertising provider via said host to said consumer station

wherein, said participant, responsive to an invitation from said host can selectively view said advertising; wherein, when said consumer elects to view advertising from said advertising provider via said host the consumer receives rewards commensurate with the length of time advertising is viewed (figure 3 #60, column 10 lines 39-58) and wherein, the participant at the consumer station views said advertising material without software being downloaded and installed into the participant station from the host (column 11 lines 11-24). Goldhaber does not explicitly teach a random non-targeted invitation. However, Haitsuka discloses a consumer receives advertising material by responding to a random non-targeted invitation to the consumer from the host (figure 3 #210, the example advertisement to "Banish your Belly" to be displayed for all, not just the overweight consumer). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldhaber and Haitsuka so a consumer receives advertising material by responding to a random non-targeted invitation to the consumer from the host. Sending advertisements to all consumers can bring in extra sales from people with a secret or untargeted condition. Concerning the step of "when said consumer elects to view advertising from said advertising provider via said host the consumer receives commensurate with the length of time advertising is viewed and wherein, the participant at the consumer station views said advertising material

without software being downloaded and installed into the participant station from the host “; that limitation is optional, and according to the MPEP, “language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation” (MPEP 2106.II. C).

Regarding claim 2, Goldhaber does not explicitly teach an invitation cancelling itself and reappearing randomly at a later time. Haitsuka discloses a predetermined idleness criteria such that in the event the participant station fails to respond to the random non-targeted or targeted invitation within a predetermined period, the invitation will cancel itself and reappear at a later time at the participant station allowing the participant repeated opportunity to elect whether to receive advertising material while on line.(figure 2, #110 and figure 3 #210, column 12 lines 7-10).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldhaber and Haitsuka to have a predetermined idleness criteria such that in the event the participant station fails to respond to the random non-targeted or targeted invitation within a predetermined period, the invitation will cancel itself and reappear at a later time at the participant station allowing the participant repeated opportunity to elect whether to receive advertising

material while on line. Haitsuka teaches that this self canceling and reappearing process permits browsing by the user and displaying of advertisements by the client application without interfering with the user's use of the browser application (column12 lines 19-20).

Concerning the step of "in the event the participant station fails to respond to the random invitation within a predetermined period, the invitation will cancel itself and reappear at a later time at the participant station allowing the participant repeated opportunity to elect whether to receive advertising material while on line"; "language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation" (MPEP 2106.II. C).

Regarding claim 3, Goldhaber discloses the participant is able to view advertising simultaneously with information from said information provider at the option of the participant, thereby allowing the participant to gain a reward as a result of a participant's election to view the advertising (column lines 50-57).

Regarding claim 4, Goldhaber discloses an advertising station remote from the participant station (figure 1 110, column 9 lines 62-66)

Regarding claim 5, Goldhaber does not explicitly teach a flashing icon. However Haitsuka discloses a flashing icon (column 10 lines 10-15). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldhaber and Haitsuka to display a flashing icon. A flashing icon, like a flashing light on a police car, is well known to signal urgency.

Regarding claim 6, Goldhaber discloses where participant station is a computer (figure 1 104, column 9 lines 35-38).

Regarding claim 7, Goldhaber discloses wherein said participant station is a personal computer. Goldhaber does not explicitly disclose wherein said participant station is a digital television receiver, web pad or Wireless Application Protocol phone. However Haitsuka discloses a flashing icon (figure 1 100, column 5 lines 9-13). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldhaber and Haitsuka to send advertisements to a Wireless Application Protocol phone. Wap phones can display the same web browser applications as a PC, so many users have no other computer, only a WAP phone to display web applications.

Regarding claim 8, Goldhaber does not explicitly disclose advertisements appearing at a predetermined location on a display at the consumer station. However, Haitsuka discloses advertisements appear at a predetermined location on a display at the consumer station. (Figure 5 210, column 10. lines 1-3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldhaber and Haitsuka so advertisements appearing at a predetermined location on a display at the consumer station. Consumers know to look for Advertisements that appear at a predetermined location on a display at the consumer station.

Regarding claim 9, Goldhaber does not explicitly disclose banner ads. However, Haitsuka discloses advertising appears at said consumer station as a banner on said display (Figure 5 210, column 10. lines 11-15). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldhaber and Haitsuka so advertising appears at said consumer station as a banner on said display. Banner ads are well known in the art to attract attention.

Regarding claim 10, Goldhaber does not explicitly disclose banner ads. However, Haitsuka discloses advertising appears at said consumer station as a banner on said display and said icon appears at any location

within a banner (Figure 5 210, column10. lines 11-15). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldhaber and Haitsuka so advertising appears at said consumer station as a banner on said display . Banner ads are well known in the art to attract attention.

Regarding claim 11, Goldhaber does not explicitly disclose banner ads. However, Haitsuka discloses advertising appears at said consumer station as a banner on said display that is a movable banner (Figure 5 210, column10. lines 11-15). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldhaber and Haitsuka so advertising appears at said consumer station as a banner on said display . Banner ads are well known in the art to attract attention.

Regarding claim 12, Goldhaber does not explicitly disclose banner ads. However, Haitsuka discloses advertising appears at said consumer station as a banner on said display and an icon visible irrespective of its location within said banner and when received at said consumer station is enabled by an internet browser appearing in a banner (Figure5 210, column10. lines 11-15). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the

teachings of Goldhaber and Haitsuka so advertising appears at said consumer station as a banner on said display . Banner ads are well known in the art to attract internet browsing and clicking attention.

Regarding claim 13, Goldhaber does not explicitly disclose the display style of the advertisements chosen. However, Haitsuka discloses advertising selected for viewing by said participant is displayed independent of any data or images displayed on said screen at said consumer station (column 12 lines 18-21). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldhaber and Haitsuka, so advertising selected for viewing by said participant is displayed independent of any data or images displayed on said screen at said consumer station. Advertisements displayed independently of other data or images tends to stand out and are well known in the art to attract internet browsing and clicking attention.

Regarding claim 14, Goldhaber does not explicitly disclose wherein viewer software enabling the consumer to view advertising, is browser driven such that said software is embedded into said viewer software and wherein said viewer software does not remain at the consumer station on the computer at the termination of viewing said advertisements. However,

Haitsuka discloses wherein viewer software enabling the consumer to view advertising, is browser driven such that said software is embedded into said viewer software and wherein said viewer software does not remain at the consumer station on the computer at the termination of viewing said advertisements (figure 1 160, column 5 lines 46-48, column 5 line 64 – column 6 line 8).

Regarding claim 16, Goldhaber discloses rewards comprising rebates to participants for the costs of internet time commensurate with the time spent viewing advertising (figure 3 #60, column 10 lines 54-57).

Regarding claim 17, Goldhaber discloses a participant computer which receives electronic data or images (figure 4, 104, column 11, lines 11-24), an advertising provider in communication with said participant computer (figure 1, 106, column 9 lines 62-67). Goldhaber further discloses wherein, the advertising provider communicates with said participant computer station upon election by said participant responsive to an invitation from said advertising provider; wherein, the participant receives said advertising material by responding to a random invitation from the advertising provider appearing at the participant's station without software being downloaded to the participant's station (figure 1, #106, column 9 lines 62-67 and column 11 lines 11-24) and wherein, when said

participant elects to view advertising from said advertising provider the participant receives rewards (figure 3 #60, column 10 lines 39-58).

Goldhaber does not explicitly teach a random non-targeted invitation. However, Haituka discloses a consumer receives advertising material by responding to a random non-targeted invitation to the consumer from the host (figure 3 #210, the example advertisement to "Banish your Belly" to be displayed for all, not just the overweight consumer). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldhaber and Haituka so a consumer receives advertising material by responding to a random non-targeted invitation to the consumer from the host. Sending advertisements to all consumers can bring in extra sales from people with a secret or untargeted condition. Concerning the step of "the advertising provider communicates with said participant computer upon election by said participant responsive to an invitation from said advertising provider; wherein, the participant receives said advertising material by responding to a random invitation from the advertising provider appearing at the participant's computer without requiring consumer oriented enabling software downloaded to the consumer computer, and wherein, when said participant elects to view advertising from said advertising provider the participant receives rewards, credits, bonuses or selected benefits commensurate with the length of time advertising is viewed" and the step

of "when said participant elects to view advertising from said advertising provider the participant receives rewards, credits, bonuses or selected benefits commensurate with the length of time advertising is viewed"; these limitations are optional, and according to the MPEP, "language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation" (MPEP 2106.II. C).

Regarding claim 18, Goldhaber does not explicitly teach a flashing icon. However, Haitzuka discloses said participant computer is connected to the internet and wherein said invitation is random and appears as a flashing icon on the screen of the consumer computer terminal, the process including a predetermined idleness criteria such that in the event the participant computer fails to respond to the random invitation within a predetermined period, the invitation will terminate and reappear randomly at a later time on the participant computer thereby allowing the participant repeated opportunity to elect whether to receive advertising material while on line (figure 2, 110, column 12 lines 7-10). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldhaber and Haitzuka to display a flashing icon. A flashing icon, like a flashing light on a police cart, a well known to signal urgency. Concerning the step of "in the event the participant

computer fails to respond to the random invitation within a predetermined period, the invitation will terminate and reappear randomly at a later time on the participant computer thereby allowing the participant repeated opportunity to elect whether to receive advertising material while on line"; that limitation is optional, and according to the MPEP, "language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation" (MPEP 2106.II. C).

Regarding claim 19, Haitsuka discloses the participant is able to view advertising simultaneously with Internet information at the option of the participant, thereby allowing the participant to offset the cost of Internet time commensurate with the extent of exposure to advertising provided by the advertising provider (figure 3 280 and 300, column 12 lines 17-20). Concerning the step of "the participant is able to view advertising simultaneously with Internet information at the option of the participant, thereby allowing the participant to offset the cost of Internet time commensurate with the extent of exposure to advertising provided by the advertising provider"; that limitation is optional, and according to the MPEP, "language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation" (MPEP 2106.II. C).

Regarding claim 21, 23, 24, 27-30, Goldhaber discloses an advertising provider in communication with said participant computer while the participant is obtaining data or information from an information provider, wherein the advertising provider communicates with said participant computer via the advertising provider's web site (figure 1, #106, column 9 lines 62-67) upon election by said participant responsive to an invitation from said advertising provider; wherein, without requiring software downloaded to the participant computer, the participant views said advertising material by responding to a random invitation from the advertising provider appearing on the participant computer (column 10 lines 39-56) ;in the event the participant computer fails to respond to the invitation within a predetermined period the participant will not receive advertising rewards for viewing said advertising, whereupon the invitation will reappear randomly at a later time on the participant's computer display allowing the participant repeated opportunity to elect whether to receive advertising material while on line (fig 3 60, column 10 lines 39-58), wherein upon acceptance by the consumer of advertising by signaling the advertising provider, advertisements will be sent to the consumer's computer for a predetermined random period following which the advertisements will be suspended until reactivated by the consumer by signaling the advertising provider; the process thereby allowing the

participant to view advertising simultaneously with Internet information at the option of the participant, thereby allowing the participant to receive rewards to offset the cost of Internet time commensurate with the extent of exposure by the participant to advertising messages; the process operable without the need for the consumer to download specific software, and registering with the advertising provider by forwarding to the provider the participant's identifying information (figure 7, #120, column 12 line 37-50). Goldhaber does not explicitly disclose said non-targeted invitation appearing as a flashing icon on a display the participant computer and including a predetermined idleness criteria. Haitsuka discloses a predetermined idleness criteria such that in the event the participant station fails to respond to the random invitation within a predetermined period, the invitation will cancel itself and reappear at a later time at the participant station allowing the participant repeated opportunity to elect whether to receive advertising material while on line (figure 2, #110, column 12 lines 7-10). Haitsuka further discloses a consumer receives advertising material by responding to a random non-targeted invitation to the consumer from the host (figure 3 #210, the example advertisement to "Banish your Belly" to displayed for all , not just the overweight consumer). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldhaber and Haitsuka to have a predetermined idleness criteria such that in the event

the participant station fails to respond to the random non-targeted invitation within a predetermined period, the invitation will cancel itself and reappear at a later time at the participant station allowing the participant repeated opportunity to elect whether to receive advertising material while on line. Haitsuka teaches that this self canceling and reappearing process permits browsing by the user and displaying of advertisements by the client application without interfering with the user's use of the browser application (column12 lines 19-20, and sending advertisements to all consumers can bring in extra sales from people with a secret or untargeted condition. Concerning the steps of "upon election by said participant", and "in the event that...", and "allowing the participant repeated opportunity to elect whether to receive advertising material while on line", and "allowing the participant to view advertising simultaneously with Internet information at the option of the participant"; these limitations are optional, and according to the MPEP, "language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation" (MPEP 2106.II. C).

Response to Remarks

This rejection has been amended to reflect the changes to the claim language. and addresses any arguments submitted by the applicant. Therefore, the Examiner maintains the rejection to the Applicant's claims.

Applicant argues regarding claim 1 and 17 that "Goldhaber...and Haitsuka... requires consumer software downloading". The Examiner disagrees, and maintains that Web browser and other software applications for the internet do not require software downloading. Wikipedia.org defines download as " In computer networks, to download means to receive data to a local system from a remote system, or to initiate such a data transfer, so software download defines software applications instead of data. The system of Goldhaber can be said to operate using software that has been copied at the hard drive factory, or from a CD-ROM or flash drive. Downloading is not mandated or required by the method of Goldhaber or Haitsuka. Therefore, the Examiner respectfully finds the Applicant's arguments unpersuasive.

Applicant argues that "Haitsuka ..does not... include a predetermined idleness criteria such that in the event the consumer station fails to respond to the random invitation within a predetermined period, the invitation will cancel itself and reappear at a later time at the consumer station". The Examiner disagrees. The cited section of Haitsuka teaches

that an invitation cancelling itself and reappearing randomly at a later time permits browsing by the user and displaying of advertisements by the client application without interfering with the user's use of the browser application by describing how the advertisement works like a screen a screen saver in reverse, and combines with Goldhaber's method of rewarding viewing of advertisements to present more advertisements to the user. Therefore, Examiner believes the combined references are still a reasonable teaching of the claimed invention in this regard, and the 103 rejection still stands.

Conclusion

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Daniel Sorkowitz whose telephone number is (571) 270-5206.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/D.M.S./
Examiner, Art Unit 3622

/Michael Bekerman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3622